

The

Philanthropist.

CINCINNATI, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1841.

WHOLE NO. 285

VOLUME VI. NO. 25.

THE PHILANTHROPIST,
PUBLISHED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE OHIO STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
Main st., between 4th & 5th, East side.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

SAMUEL A. ALLEY, Printer.

TERMS.—TWO DOLLARS a year in advance,
Letters on business should be directed to the Publishing Agent, WILLIAM DEARLOVE—those relating to the editorial department, to the EDITOR—In all cases post paid.

Terms of Advertising.

One square of 16 lines, or less, one insertion, \$ 0 50
" " each additional insertion, 0 30
" " for 6 months, without alteration, 5 00
" " with alterations, 0 00
" " 1 year " 10 00
A discount of 20 per cent. on all advertisements occupying one half, two-thirds or an entire column.

For the Philanthropist.

CONCLUSION OF C. C. BURLEIGH'S FIRST LECTURE.

From the simple declaration that man's rights are the gift of the Creator, they are bestowed in the act of creation, and are inalienable, we might indeed, without other evidence infer that no human government can take them away. For who can alienate from us what is inalienable? What infer or power can revoke the grant of the sovereign? The government may hinder the enjoyment of a right, but cannot take away the right itself. To attempt it, we have seen, is to rebel against the higher government, and rebellion cannot invest the rebel with lawful authority.

But we are not left to infer this truth from the fact that God is the author of human rights, though that were enough to establish it. Turn we for farther testimony to the declaration. After asserting in the language already recited, that all men have these inalienable rights, it proceeds to say, "that to secure these rights, governments are instituted, deriving all their just powers from the consent of the governed." Unless, then, the governed have consented that their government shall have power to annihilate their rights, it has none, and can have none, and what it never had, it can never get. But who will assert that any class of men in our country have consented to the privation of their rights, or to the possession of the power by government to subject them to such privation? Does any man in his senses believe that the slave ever consented to be a slave, or authorized any man or body of men to make him one? Where is the proof of his consent? It must not be taken for granted. Does it appear in the solicitude of the slaveholder to deny him every possibility of speaking his own mind or acting out his own will? Is it shown in his forbidding even to go beyond the boundaries of his master's plantation without that master's written permission? Is it seen in all the contrivances devised to prevent his escape; in the anxiety manifested by the South, after exhausting her ingenuity in perfecting these contrivances at home, to enlist the North in auxiliary schemes to make them effectual; to obtain a constitutional guarantee of her pretended right to catch her runaway slaves in the free States also; to procure legislative enactments in aid of the constitution, and even exceeding its demands, in the frequent escapes from the land of bondage in spite of all the watchfulness with which its outlets are guarded, whether by the slaveholder or his northern sentinels and allies?

It is useless, however, to offer proof that the slave has never given the supposed consent, for he could not give it if he could. What he has not, he cannot give. No man has such a right over his own person as would authorize him to consent to his own enslavement. To be rightfully held in slavery, is to be destitute of what none has a right to surrender. To consent to enslavement is to renounce his allegiance to the Supreme Ruler, to yield up his rights of conscience, to set his master above his Maker, and to agree that he will worship and obey his God only as a fellow man may give him leave. Though he may hereafter, if not now, believe it his religious duty to engage in certain religious observances, attend meetings at certain times for social worship, or join some particular religious society, he binds himself beforehand that without his master's permission it shall not be done. No man who has not a right to place a fatal mortal above all that is called God or is worshipped; no man who has not a right to destroy the world's Sovereign, and set a tyrant in his place. Government, then, having no power but what it derives from the consent of the governed, and the governed having none to consent to the privation of natural rights, in any instance, they never were, and never will be, for they never can, legally taken away.

We reach the same conclusion from another starting point—an other line of approach. All men have an inalienable right to life, to liberty, to the pursuit of happiness—for the security of these rights governments are instituted. To secure, not to destroy them. Of course, whenever the government attempts to destroy them, it acts against the very purpose of its institution. But to do this is just so far to change its own character—to annul its own authority as a government. If you appoint an agent for a specific purpose, defining his powers in the commission you give him, and he goes beyond the limit you have set, nay, tries to exceed the very bounds of his appointment, he ceases to be your agent—you are not bound by your agent's acts done in your name, thus contrary to your express design. Suppose that when you send him to take the oversight of your manufacture, and authorise him to pledge your credit for the purchase of materials and the hire of laborers for its business, he employs men to pull down the dam, demolish the buildings, break the machinery in pieces and throw it into the river, and burn up the materials already procured, to be wrought up by it, is he in all this your agent? Are you bound by his contracts made in your name for these purposes? Must you pay the laborers by whose hands he has done the mischief? No more is the government any longer the people's agent, when it invades the people's rights, which it was formed to secure. The instant it begins to assail these rights, or attempts to wrest them away, it has ceased to be a government. Having gone over the limits of its authority, having sought to defeat the purpose of its creation, it has become a rank usurpation, and we are no more bound by its acts than to this unwarranted end, than if it never had been a government. That it was once invested with governmental power, no more proves that it has still, than the action of the members of the Slave Legislature prove their right to be a government. The Government, then, cannot make lawful the taking away of a man's rights, since the mere attempt to do so, destroys its authority as a government. As well might I seize a blazing firebrand to burn the Ohio river to ashes, I may thrust my hand into the waters, but when I look to see them wrapped in flames, lo! my torch is extinguished, and the stream flows on as it was wont.

The framers of the declaration so understood this doctrine is plain, for they not only assert as we have seen, that the very object of government is to secure the natural rights of the governed, but add that when it becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it—may, that when its cause is such as evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is both their right and their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. It is their right to institute a new government, founded on such principles, and organized in such form as to then shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Such is the view, then, of the men who wrote and signed this noble instrument. The safety and happiness of the governed, the security of their natural rights, these are the only purposes for which rulers are entrusted with power, which legislatures are authorized to enact laws, and executives to carry them into effect. Whatever defeats these, is usurpation—usurpation which the governed hold rightfully may and ought to throw.

The conclusion from all this is inevitable, that no government can take a single natural right from even the meaneest of its subjects. No law can be made authorizing a man to hold a slave, which he has a legal right to enforce, requiring a man to be a slave, which he is legally bound to obey.

But, say some, the Declaration of Independence is mere

an expression of opinions, not an instrument of legal authority. The Constitution is the supreme law, and the Declaration is no part of this. If the Constitution guarantees slavery, it is a legal system, let the Declaration say what it may.

Admitting this a moment, for the sake of argument, still slavery is not safe in all the slave states if it is in any. Some of them, if not all, have put into their state constitutions the doctrines and almost the words of the declaration. That of Virginia, for example, asserts in its bill of rights that "all men are born equally free and independent," and maintains that government is instituted to secure the rights, and has the source of its power in the will of the people whom it governs. Other states hold in their constitutions substantially the same doctrines, less explicitly stated, it may be, but still plainly enough to show that they are regarded as fundamental. Within these states, therefore, if in no others, slavery is unlawful, because unconstitutional. We have high legal authority for this opinion. It is well known that when Massachusetts adopted it in her constitution, the same bill of rights—principally in principle and nearly in language—that which makes up the body of the constitution of Virginia, the supreme court of Massachusetts decided that no man could any longer be held as a slave in that state. I believe the soundness of this decision has never been questioned, nor will it be probably, by any lawyer who values his professional reputation. No state in the union can boast a court whose decisions are more respected than those of the supreme court of Massachusetts. But if the principle in question so operates as we see it does, when embodied in the constitution of one state, why not in that of another? If slavery is unconstitutional in Massachusetts—as all admit—it is equally so in Virginia, equally so in every state whose constitution is based on the doctrine of equal human rights, or recognizes the will of the governed as the slave as an institution can never support itself. Labor is rendered disreputable. No man where slavery exists will labor who can avoid it; the consequence has been that a larger amount of non-laboring population has accumulated in the Southern states, than the laborers who possibly be driven to support. The deficiency must come from somewhere, & as we are in a degree dependent upon them for a market, for our surplus products, the credit system being natural to our country in its present condition, it devolves on us to do a large share in the support of a host of luxurious idlers. Let any one who doubts this, compute from the census tables, the probable number of non-producers in the slave states, and estimate the probable amount of their annual expenses, in the extravagant habits natural to those who never learn the value of wealth by the only test, the labor of producing it; and judge whether it be likely that the negroes, after supporting themselves, can produce the enormous sum. For proof that they do not, let him glance at the pres't indebtedness of the South to the North, estimated from three to five hundred millions of dollars, which will never be paid. It is reasonable to suppose that those who acknowledge by practice, their willingness to obtain if possible, their whole subsistence by robbing the black man, can have little scruple in making up any deficiencies, by fraud upon the whites. We deny, therefore, that the constitution admits, and is built upon the self-evident truths of the declaration, as in effect to deny the illegality of slavery but the legality of the constitution.

If on the other hand the constitution does admit and stand upon these self-evident truths, it matters not as to whether the adoption is not adopted by it word and form, as part of itself. The principles of the declaration having become those of the constitution, every state constitution or practice contrary to the intent of it—is unconstitutional, and of course unlawful. So far as the question of the legality is concerned, it makes no difference in the weight of the argument or the certainty of the conclusion against it, whether the constitution was written, does or does not contain provisions intended as a guarantee of the assumed right to hold slaves.

The further consideration of the subject, the application of the principles I have endeavored to establish, and the inferences to be drawn from the doctrines here presented, are reserved for another discourse.

For the Philanthropist.

TO THE HON. JEREMIAH MORROW.

SIR.—The undersigned a portion of your constituents, all or most of whom assisted by their votes to place you in your present position in the national councils, are desirous of conferring with you in this manner, upon our political and pecuniary condition as a people.—With a country exhibiting almost unexampled natural advantages for the support of a prosperous and happy population, and political institutions in theory the least possible burden upon the people, it is a fact which none can deny, that nearly the whole of our citizens are harassed by debts they know not how to discharge, or deterred by the menacing aspect of the times, from engaging upon active business operations for the future.—Such an overwhelming pecuniary distress in a fertile and growing country, is not however, altogether unaccountable. Statesmen, and politicians of one political party, are fond of attributing it to one or more ostensible causes—the same class of men in another party, account for it on other and different grounds, while the country groans on, and finds no alleviation of its distress by the plan of relief proposed by either. We believe that the reason for this may be found in the fact, that both parties are mistaken as to the original and primary cause of our distress and difficulties. Those which they point to as the causes, are to us evidently but effects, and the failure of all the remedies they propose, to effect their object.

An examination into the situation of a portion of our population in relation to others, and to the government, and of the Constitution of the United States in reference to the whole, we find that by the third clause of the second section, of the first article, and by the second clause of the first section, of the second article of that instrument, a privileged class has been created in our government. By state enactments, the exercise of the rights of a portion of our population is withheld, while the Constitution of the United States, in fact, confers upon another class political power in consequence of this deprivation of the exercise of rights by the first mentioned. An anti-republican inequality in the political power of our citizens is thus originated. The difference in our institutions in regard to the laboring class, added to those of climate, renders the productions of different portions of the country totally unlike. The staple productions of the South cannot be nearly consumed at home, but seek a market in foreign ports. The staple productions of the North, on the contrary, must be principally consumed at home, and the South affords almost the only market for the surplus product of labor of the free states. Thus circumstanced, that portion of the people of this Union who have unequal political power conferred upon them, has a direct pecuniary interest in employing this power, to depress the value of labor and its products among the other portion. We would respectfully ask your attention to the past legislation and diplomacy of the general government, in reference to the products of free and slave labor, and to the proofs therein adduced, that the political power hinted at, has been unscrupulously employed for the agrandizement of a part of the people in one section of the Union, and the depression of the whole of them in the other. Observe what quarter our Presidents have been selected—our foreign ministers—and what have been the objects at which those functionaries have principally aimed.—

Look at the acquisition of Louisiana, and Florida,—the grasping at Texas,—as slaveholding territory, by strict constructionists of the constitution too, upon all subjects from whence no aid could be expected to assist in building up this aristocracy in our land. Forget not the invasion of a neutral territory, before the purchase of Florida, and the still existing bloody and expensive war in that quarter, the principal burden of which falls upon one section of the country, for the benefit, if such it be, of a few, who own "property" in their fellow men. Look at the Republic of Hayti, with its independence still unacknowledged, and the valuable commerce of our merchants in its ports left unprotected,—at the tax the whole people must pay to sustain the sugar-growers of the South. To these we refer, as a few only of the evidences to which we might point you, of our assertions.—Did the evil stop even here, the prosperity of our country, checked by these means, and by the deranged state of our currency springing from the same root, would still not be destroyed.

A system of credit is natural to, and inseparable from, the circumstances which surround a population like that of our free states. United in the government, and so intimately connected by commercial arrangements; and the capacities in each to supply different wants in the other, this credit as naturally becomes extended to the slave states. These, from their unproductive system of labor, are always poor—indeed, it is demonstrable that slavery as an institution can never support itself. Labor is rendered disreputable. No man where slavery exists will labor who can avoid it; the consequence has been that a larger amount of non-laboring population has accumulated in the Southern states, than the laborers who possibly be driven to support. The deficiency must come from somewhere, & as we are in a degree dependent upon them for a market, for our surplus products, the credit system being natural to our country in its present condition, it devolves on us to do a large share in the support of a host of luxurious idlers. Let any one who doubts this, compute from the census tables, the probable number of non-producers in the slave states, and estimate the probable amount of their annual expenses, in the extravagant habits natural to those who never learn the value of wealth by the only test, the labor of producing it; and judge whether it be likely that the negroes, after supporting themselves, can produce the enormous sum. For proof that they do not, let him glance at the pres't indebtedness of the South to the North, estimated from three to five hundred millions of dollars, which will never be paid. It is reasonable to suppose that those who acknowledge by practice, their willingness to obtain if possible, their whole subsistence by robbing the black man, can have little scruple in making up any deficiencies, by fraud upon the whites. We deny, therefore, that the tax upon the labor of the North, for the support of this southern aristocracy, at this time does not fall so very short of the whole amount they plunder from the negroes. Hence we can readily account for the "hard times," which appear periodically in our country and why they become harder at every return. Hence too, we can readily believe that no administration of the government, by an arrangement of its financial concern can alleviate present difficulties, to any considerable extent. The credit system is for the present checked, and when the laboring population of the North, shall have produced enough to make up for the loss of their former earnings, now owed for, and never to be paid by the South, and upon the strength of which we went into debt, ourselves, the times will begin to be easier and not sooner. After this brief notice of the cause of our difficulties, we come to consider the remedy. Viewing the present and probable future condition of the whole country, unpopular as the declaration may be, we unhesitatingly express our conviction, that the American people can hope for no permanent prosperity, until they accede to the immediate, emancipation of the whole of the slave population upon the soil, consult the whole history of the human race, but particularly that of the West Indies. The inculcable advantage it must prove to the negro race should also be kept in view. The question must be met—the contest between free and slave labor, long influencing the interests of our country, has arrived at a crisis which renders apparent that the end is near. The alternative presents itself—emancipation to the negro, or the enslavement of the white laborer, and the choice cannot long be delayed. We may as well look it boldly in the face at once, and decide upon our course. We address you, to obtain a public expression of your opinion upon the topics here presented. We desire to be informed, whether you will employ your influence in the national legislature, in favor of equalizing the political power of the citizens of this Union—whether you will endeavor to change the course of legislation, so as to render it impartial—whether you will vote for purging the national domain, including the District of Columbia, of the sin of slavery, & thus by the exercise of the moral power of the nation, influence so far as it may, the legislation of the states upon this subject, which we cannot reach other than by a moral influence. Taxed indirectly to an amount compared with that against which our fathers struggled through a seven years war, sinks into insignificance—threatened in our liberties, by the propagation of the right of petition, and the present annihilation of nearly all legal protection to our own individual freedom, for the support of an oppressive aristocracy.—WE are determined to resist by all moral and constitutional means, until our rights are secured, by a guarantee of perfect liberty and equality to all men within our borders. What response shall we have from you, the servants whom we have chosen to aid in the protection of our rights and liberties.

OCT. 10, 1841.
Perry Dakin,
Thomas H. Higinson,
Elijah Peebles,
William Odorn,
A. Brooke,
Samuel Hollingsworth,
Isaac Davis,
Howell Thompson,
Jesse Hughes, Jr.,
Cyrus Carter,
Jonah Farquhar,
Vincent Brown,
Thomas H. Higinson,
Elijah Peebles,
William Odorn,
A. Brooke,
Samuel Hollingsworth,
Isaac Davis,
Howell Thompson,
Jesse Hughes, Jr.,
Cyrus Carter,
Jonah Farquhar,
B. C. Gilbert,
Joseph Lukens,
Charles Haynes,
John Falles,
Job Jeffries, Jr.,
Enoch Harlan,
Samuel Biracial,
Benjamin Howland,
Clark Howland,
Eber W. Howland,
Isaac Barnes,
Iaac A. West,
Jabez Hutton,
Artemas Nickerson,
John C. Work,
Isaac Davis,
Amos Davis,
Samuel Brooks,
Wright Haynes,
Samuel G. Welsh,

Joel Jeffries,
David McMillen,
Ezekiel Underwood,
Henry Gilpin,
Newton McMillen,
Samuel Haynes,
John T. Burgess,
Jabez H. Crew,
Sylvanus Talbert,
Isaac Hiatt,
Milton M. Macy,
Joseph Burgess,
Amos Welch,
Wm. Macy,
Valentine Nicholson,
Edward L. Macy,
Josse Harvey,
Richard Mendenhall,
Isaac Noyes,
Thomas M. Wailes,
Thomas Barnes,
Samuel H. Hoge,
B. C. Gilbert,
Joseph Lukens,
Charles Haynes,
John Falles,
Job Jeffries, Jr.,
Enoch Harlan,
Samuel Biracial,
Benjamin Howland,
Clark Howland,
Eber W. Howland,
Isaac Barnes,
Iaac A. West,
Jabez Hutton,
Artemas Nickerson,
John C. Work,
Isaac Davis,
Amos Davis,
Samuel Brooks,
Wright Haynes,
Samuel G. Welsh,

Jersey Taylor,
Asa H. Hoge,
B. C. Gilbert,
Joseph Lukens,
Charles Haynes,
John Falles,
Job Jeffries, Jr.,
Enoch Harlan,
Samuel Biracial,
Benjamin Howland,
Clark Howland,
Eber W. Howland,
Isaac Barnes,
Iaac A. West,
Jabez Hutton,
Artemas Nickerson,
John C. Work,
Isaac Davis,
Amos Davis,
Samuel Brooks,
Wright Haynes,
Samuel G. Welsh,

the letter as well as the spirit of his word as revealed in the Scriptures.

The means relied on for the vindication of these opinions are certain perversions or falsifications of the true meaning of certain passages in the Levitical code employed in describing the Hebrew servitude, but one of which I shall specially notice in this connexion, and that merely because sufficient pains seem to me not to have been taken by previous writers to refute it.

Perversions of the Scriptures are either by false translations, false constructions, or by both. I now call the special attention of the critical reader to a most remarkable case of perversion, in which both of these means have been employed, for the sake of which the grand Sacerdotal perversion mainly relies for its support. The grand Sacerdotal perversion mainly relies for its support the identification of human slavery among Christians, and upon the strength of which this abominable institution has been permitted to exist and flourish among more than four hundred years, is in the false translation and false construction of the 44th, 45th and 46th Verses of the 25th chapter of Leviticus. The friends of human slavery always first resort to this celebrated passage as a triumphant vindication of their bloody idol. The literal translation of these verses is as follows:

To the Hon. J. Morrow.
DEAR SIR.—It was intended to have forwarded you this address through the press—an accident has delayed it until we fear it may not reach you before leaving for Washington, so we send it to you in this form. If you will please forward it with your reply to any paper you may choose to publish, you will oblige,

Yours, &c.; A. BROOKS, and others.

P. S.—If you prefer to address us in private, we will attend to the publication. Post Office address, Oakland, Clinton Co., Ohio.

CINCINNATIANS BEWARE!
The scriptures represent a certain class of men as sowing the wind, and reaping the whirlwind. Franklin spoke of those who were pennywise, and pound foolish. Some are said to savor at the spit-got and let out at the bung-hole. These are they, in an eminent degree, who are giving property to the nation, by throwing the shield of public opinion around the thrifless, land-consuming, sun-seeking breeding system of slavery, in order to protect it from the arrows of justice. By this system, the whole country has been defrauded, within the last half century, to an amount that is absolutely astounding, and almost incalculable. Look, for example, for its effects upon the proud and beggar State of Virginia—which State which once stood foremost in the Union, in point of population, wealth, influence and resources, but is now surpassed by several of the free States. Comparing her with New York, from 1790, to 1830, a period of forty years, (a slaveholder himself, C. C. Clay being witness,) she has lost in population nearly a million in ¹⁸³⁰, having increased in a ratio of only sixteen per cent, while New York has increased in a ratio of nearly five hundred and sixty per cent! Her real and personal property ought to be some six or eight hundred millions of dollars greater than it is; and this has been wholly swallowed up by her corrupt slave system, which like the gnat is ever crying, "Give, give, give," and is satisfied. The negro army of Virginia, in Virginia, (nearly half a million of slaves included, at market value) is much less than one-half that of the Empire State, without a single laborer on the soil being brought into the account! And yet in 1790 the population of Virginia was more than double that of New York; and as for her position, soil and climate, all these give her a decided advantage over her great and victorious rival.

It is hardly necessary for me to add, that the common English translation of this passage is a caricature of it in the original Hebrew, and is so plain and audacious a falsification withal, that any tyro in the Hebrew language can detect it. The foregoing is as exact a literal translation of it as can be made, though some of the words employed in it may be varied or exchanged for others, without altering the true sense, and without any perversion of the true meaning; but the true sense and meaning cannot be better understood by any alteration of the word "hire," we

Massachusetts. He himself, with nineteen other colored men, enlisted on board the "Royal Louis," under Captain Decatur, was taken prisoner, and confined for seven months in the horrible old Jersey prison ship.

Such are the men, with their descendants, who are now persecuted and proscribed in almost all parts of the Union—the victims of mob law and black law in Ohio—and of the diabolical benevolence of colonization in Maryland. Even in Massachusetts, one of those old Revolutionary soldiers, if he attempted to seat himself in any other than the "negro car," on some of the railroads, would be thrust out with ruffian violence, and that, too, on the very anniversary of the independence for which he fought. "Hail, Columbia!"—Emancipator.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI,
Wednesday Morning, December 22, 1841.

ARGUMENT OF BOONE—DUTIES OF ABOLITIONISTS UNDER THE LAW.

We are now to notice the chief argument of Boone. He assumes, that "it is anti-christian, as it is certainly anti-American to violate law, and defy the powers that be"—"that the fundamental law of the land recognizes slavery, and guarantees the rights of the slaveholder"—that abolitionists are violators of this law, and therefore are morally criminal, their conduct being opposed to the spirit and example of Jesus Christ. Lest we should misrepresent him, we quote his own language.

"The glorious example of the Son of God, bazing resolute with peace and good will to man should guide them in all controversy with their fellow-men. Is there in all his walk and conversation an instance of violation of order or of law? His disciples were evil entreated, but turned not upon their persecutors. In all that Volume of Wisdom and Goodness, obedience to the laws and the rulers was taught by precept and by example. Nor are we left to infer that this was on account of the superior excellency of those having authority—not yet of the perfect adaptation of those laws to the best interests of God and man. It was elsewhere to those laws and rulers as they were, and what they wanted in perfection was to be supplied by the goodness and patient bearing of those who were under them. 'For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil.' Let every soul be subject unto the higher power." We will not amplify on this point. But to apply.—The fundamental law of the land recognizes slavery, and guarantees the rights of the slaveholder to them as property. Now, the question here is not, "Is this right?"—but, "Is it true? So long as it remains true it is the law, and it is the duty of every good citizen to obey the law, 'not only for wrath but for conscience' sake,"—"rendering unto all their due." It is the law of Ohio that every colored person coming within her borders shall give bond for his or her good behavior, and that they will not become a charge upon the county or township, and all persons employing such negroes before this law has been completed with, shall pay a fine!—Then no order-loving and conscientious citizen should violate it. Is it the law of Ohio that all fugitive slaves escaping from service into her territory shall be given up to the person or persons claiming such service? Then it ought to be done according to the true intent and meaning of such law. It surely should not be resisted by conscientious men or women. Is it a felony to assist a fugitive slave escaping from his owner, or to harbor him after such escape? Then love to the colored man and sympathy for his wrongs must be strong in those who would peril all of reputation and family hope in his cause, in this violation of human law and divine precept and example. And what is the reward? For men act from some motive of interest—the smile of God or man—the consciousness of doing right, or gain. Can you find it within the list of the bibles—in the moral sense of the community? Then let him figure it out in the prison—or let him send Onocrus home, instructed in all the ways of his duty—"obeying the law according to the flesh, not with eye-service as men please, but with good service as unto Christ." Now it is vain to say these things have not been done by abolitionists. The proof is ready,—the records of the Courts show it. You may say that honest abolitionists have not done it. Then I say, come out from among them."

HUMAN LAW—THE DUTY OF OBEDIENCE.

The broad principle on which this argument rests, is, that the citizens of a government, are morally bound, in all cases, to obey all its laws—that this implicit and uniform obedience is enjoined by the New Testament.

The principle is as dangerous as it is false. If human legislators were infallible—if their enactments were never repugnant to the law of God, the principle would be sound. But the supposition, as Boone is fully aware, is a monstrous one. The laws which in some countries violate liberty of conscience, by excluding all religions but one; which in others, sustain idolatry, and prohibit the introduction of any new form of Theology; which in others, tax dissenters to support an established faith, deemed by them inconsistent with the word of God—all are examples of the occasional conflict of human with divine law, and, Boone himself will admit, may be rightfully disobeyed. To be more specific. There are three cases, in which it may become a right and duty to disobey human laws.

1st. The case of Revolution. "Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends," ("life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness") "it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government." So spoke our fathers, when they refused to be "subject to the higher powers," "defied the powers that be," and renounced their allegiance to the British crown. If the principle is sound, that it is always wrong to "defy the powers that be"—that *obedience to laws and rulers as they are*, is always a duty—that every soul ought always to be subject to the higher powers—the act of our fathers was a crime, their declaration a falsehood, and our republic had its birth in rebellion against God.

2nd. A second case is, that where a law is believed by a citizen to be unconstitutional. He has a perfect right to violate this law, for the sake of bringing the question before the Supreme tribunal of the State, in order to obtain a decision on its constitutionality. If the court decide that it is unconstitutional, he has done service to his country: if, the contrary, he is bound then to obey that law, provided there be nothing unusual involved in obedience.

3d. A third case is, where any individual, after the most unprejudiced and careful inquiry, becomes convinced, that a law of the state in which he lives, commands him to do or omit, what the divine law, written on his heart or in revelation enjoins him to leave undone or to do. This must appear self-evident, when it is recollect, that the Creator has a paramount right to the obedience of his creatures—that He has conferred on every individual the right of private judgment which no one less than

God can alienate—that to Him every man must give account for himself, and that no plea for disobedience will be admitted, less than a warrant from God himself. Need we sustain this position by authority of Revelation? One of the chief lessons to be gathered from the history of Daniel, is the duty of obeying God rather than man. When the golden image was set up, and the ordinance went forth that at the "sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery and dulcimer, and all kinds of music," all the people were to fall down and worship, what was the answer of the three Hebrews, to the "higher powers?" "O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thy hand, O, King. But, if not, be it known unto thee, O, King, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." For this sublime assertion of the rights of conscience, and of the Supremacy of the Almighty, God walked with them amidst the fire, and brought them forth unharmed, to the confusion of their enemies and vindication of his own rights. Why was the Hebrew prophet stripped of his honors, and hurried into the den of lions? For violating a wicked human law, and thus maintaining his allegiance to his Maker. And what was the language of Peter and John, when brought before the constituted authorities of Jerusalem, who, hating free discussion as intensely as our rulers do now, commanded them not to speak at all or teach in the name of Jesus? "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you, more than unto God, judge ye,"—Such was their answer; and soon they are again found in Solomon's porch, *defying the powers that be*, by setting at nought their commandment. By them they are again arraigned. "Did not we strictly command you that you should not teach in his name?" inquired the haughty priest. The quiet answer of the reformers was, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Will Boone question the truth of this principle? But, we are not confined to ancient times, for examples of it.—What is the conduct of the Quakers, in regard to the war-operations of government, but a standing illustration of the great duty, that men ought to disobey human laws which are repugnant to right—they themselves, of necessity, being the rescuers, except according to the forms of law.

Carefully observing these two duties, he may do whatever else he pleases, in regard to the fugitive, and yet not violate the constitutional guaranty. With this definition of our duty, we assert boldly, that there is on record or in the history of our cause, but one instance in which an abolitionist violated this guaranty; and in that the testimony was strong, that the officer authorized to arrest the fugitive, did not show his warrant until resistance had taken place.

I have now sufficiently vindicated the anti-slavery men, from the charge of trampling under foot the constitutional guaranty of the rights of the slave-holder.

But, Boone will say, as he has said, that there are laws in our own State, in regard to colored persons, which we daily disregard. Grant it so long as we observe the requirements of the federal constitution in regard to the rights of slaveholders, and transgress none of the laws under which they live, they have no right to complain. But, here too, we are willing to explain our conduct, and to vindicate it, if necessary.

The statute of Ohio, requiring bonds and security from colored persons, and making it a penal offence for a white person to employ one who has not obtained the legal certificate, is regarded by a majority of our citizens as impracticable, execution, and unconstitutional. For the most part, it has been a dead letter, since the date of its enactment. No white person, except in times of excitement, thinks of regarding it.

Abolitionists then in this are not peculiar, nor do they evince any lawless disposition.

The other statutes they are charged with breaking, are those which make it penal, to harbor a fugitive from labor or service, or to aid him in any way in his escape through the State.

As color is no evidence of slavery in Ohio, and as the presumption is, that every person within its limits is *free*, we know not how aid or shelter granted to a fugitive, before he is claimed as such, can come within the purview of the statutes. Now whatever facilities may be afforded to fugitives, are generally furnished before any claim is set up; in which case, there is no law-breaking. It is not denied, that many of the citizens of this State, make no such discrimination—that no matter whether a claim be made or not, they are equally prompt in aiding the fugitive to escape; and in so doing, that they violate the law.

The question arises, is this one of those violations of human law, which is rendered necessary by our allegiance to a Higher Power?

Let Boone suppose himself a citizen of Ohio. He has just been examining the precepts,—

"Be ye not him that wandereth"—"Hide the out-cast;"—"Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant that has escaped from his master unto thee." Before him hangs the Declaration of Independence "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." By his side is the constitution of Ohio, reaffirming these truths with additional emphasis.

A way-faring man, of haggard looks, with the dust and sweat of travel upon him, is ushered into his presence.

"Help, master!"

"What's the matter?"

"I'm starving."

"Where are you from?"

"Kentucky."

"A runaway?"

"Yes—but do be merciful. For forty years have I been a slave. I want now to be free—to be a man—to earn something for myself, and lay by a little for my poor mother, who is still in slavery. Think how you would feel if you were a slave."

As to Mr. Lewis, he may recollect the saying of Cardinal Woolsey, when accused by his enemies.

"If I'm traduced by tongues, which neither know

My qualities, nor person, yet will be

The chronicles of my doing—let me say,

"Tis but the fact of place, and the rough brake

That virtue must go through. We must not stint

Our necessary actions in the fear

To epe malitious censures; wh ch ever,

That is now coming; but benefit no further

Than vanity bringeth; What we do best,

By sick interposers, only weak ones, is

Nat ours, or not allow'd; what worst, as oft,

Hating a grosser quality, is evill up

For our best act. If we stand still,

In fear our nation will be mock'd or despis'd;

We should take rest here where we sit, or sit

States upon."

OHIO LEGISLATURE.

Nothing of importance has yet been transacted in our legislature.

Several positions presented, praying that towns and corporations might be made liable for

dition, when introduced, that is, determine that they shall be *free*. He must concede all this, unless he would question the authority of the Supreme Court.

He will insist, however, that after all, there is *one* constitutional guaranty for the slaveholder, viz., the clause of the Constitution which provides for the surrender on proper demand of persons held to service or labor under the laws of one State, who have fled into another. Doubtless, this is a guaranty, but, let us understand clearly the nature and extent of the obligation it imposes.

Does it bind the people of the free states to catch fugitive slaves, and hold them till they may be claimed by their owners? Does it bind them to deny shelter, food, raiment, counsel, to a fugitive from service or labor, while as yet no claim is made for him? Certainly not. When a person owing service or labor under the laws of another State, escapes into Ohio, the federal Constitution provides first, that no law or regulation in this state shall discharge the fugitive from his obligations under the laws of the State from which he fled; and, secondly, that Ohio shall deliver up such fugitive, when claimed by the person to whom such service or labor is due. The single duty imposed on the State of Ohio by this clause is, to surrender a fugitive *when claimed*; which involves the duty of prescribing the process, and providing the tribunal for trying the case, and determining the character of the evidence necessary to substantiate the claim. The only duties of the citizen under this provision are, not to resist the officer authorized to arrest the person claimed as a fugitive, and not to interfere subsequently for his rescue, except according to the forms of law.

Carefully observing these two duties, he may do whatever else he pleases, in regard to the fugitive, and yet not violate the constitutional guaranty. With this definition of our duty, we assert boldly, that there is on record or in the history of our cause, but one instance in which an abolitionist violated this guaranty; and in that the testimony was strong, that the officer authorized to arrest the fugitive, did not show his warrant until resistance had taken place.

IMPORTANT CONSEQUENCES.

The opinion of Judge McLean of the Supreme Court, respecting the mode in which the federal constitution regards slaves, is highly important. His doctrine is that the constitution "treats slaves as persons"—acting "upon them as persons, and not as property." It will be recollected, that this was the position assumed by Mr. Marshall, of Kentucky, in the articles he wrote some months since, contesting the power of Congress over the domestic slave-trade. The doctrine is doubtless a sound one, but its consequences are momentous. If it be true, that the constitution acts upon slaves, as persons, and never as *property*, then the Government, whose powers are derived exclusively from this instrument, and are determined by it, can perform no act which involves the assumption, that slaves are property. All its acts in regard to slaves must proceed on the principle that slaves are *persons*; otherwise they are unconstitutional. Keeping this in view, may we not safely pronounce that the following acts are unconstitutional?

1st. The capture of negro slaves in the swamps of Florida, and distribution of them as booty, or sale of them, by officers acting under authority of the General Government.

2nd. Negotiations by the Federal Executive

with the British government, for the reclamation of fugitive slaves, the object being to reduce them again to the condition of property.

3rd. The demand by our Government for compensation for slaves as property, wreaked on British soil, and thus liberated.

4th. The enactment by Congress of the slave-laws of the District of Columbia, and the Territory of Florida, which laws regard and act upon, the slave, as *property*.

These acts are unconstitutional, because they necessarily proceed on the assumption, by Congress and the Executive, that slaves are *property*—when the constitution which grants and defines the powers of both, regards slaves, in all cases, as *persons*.

IN CHARGE.

The routes of the various canals, rail-roads and turnpikes in Indiana, are estimated at 1280 miles, of which only 281 have been finished, at an expense of \$8,164,528. The entire estimate was \$19,914,424, doubtless below the truth.

The revenue on the works don't pay expenses. The public debt amounts to \$15,088,141; the interest and a few other items amount to \$615,000; while the revenue for this year is about \$159,884,55. The State has failed to pay the interest on the public debt.

Retrenchment of expenses, rigid economy, and increased taxation are the only means by which the State can be saved.

The condition of things in some of our States, indeed throughout the whole country, reminds one of the saying of Him who spoke with authority. "For which of you intending to build a tower, setteth not down first and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it? Lest haply after he hath laid the foundation, and is unable to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him, saying, this man began to build and was not able to finish."

PLAN OF STATE RELIEF.

It is said, that President Tyler and his cabinet are in favor of purchase by the General Government of the right of transporting without further charge, mails, ordnance, munitions of war, stores, &c., &c., on all the railroads and canals of the several States, completed or in progress, at a fair and stipulated price per mile, to be paid in bonds of the United States, or in the guaranty and ultimate payment of a part of those already issued by the States themselves."

STATE CONVENTION OF THE FRIENDS OF CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY.

One week from to-day, this convention will assemble. It will be signalized by the first attempt in this state to organize a political party, on the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and for the special protection of the interests of Freedom and Free Labor. The auspices are every way favorable. The vacillating, uncertain, fruitless policy of present parties, is awakening the people to the necessity of an organization founded on higher principles, directed to nobler ends, governed by sounder policy.

The leaders in this enterprise in our state, are men of approved patriotism, much experience, unquestioned ability. They have been too long known by the political world, to be smiled at, as novices. Two of them, particularly, are gentlemen whose age and public services, must command respect.

There is every reason to believe, that the anti-slavery sentiment of Ohio will be fairly represented in the convention.

The friends of Liberty have promptly responded to the call;

and in the spirit they will manifest at the meeting, demonstration will be furnished of their inflexible purpose to make the 3000 liberty votes of this year multiply to 15000 next year, and go on multiplying, till the people of Ohio shall be brought back to the fundamental principles of civil liberty.

The convention of course will put forth an address, stating the reasons for their course, the objects they contemplate, the principles by which they intend to be governed.

What are the objects of the Liberty Party?

To effect the repeal of the laws which sustain

slavery in Florida, and slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia; to arrest the

extension of slavery by preventing the creation

of any new slave state, and the annexation of Texas; to put an end to the policy, which has

permitted the slavery interest to control the action of the General Government; to suppress

slavery in the coastwise, and the African slave-trade; to suppress unorganized the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and the press, and

the latter to surrender claim of the Russian master, any of his white slaves who might escape. What would Boone do? Seize the fugitives, and return them to bondage? Shut his door and his heart to their claims? Or rather, feeling the force of the golden rule, "whatever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them," would he not minister to their necessities, and facilitate their flight?

Again—what would Boone wish me to do for his brother, were he a slave, and should he escape out of Kentucky into Ohio? What would he have me do for himself in a like predicament?

the right of petition; and specially, to protect the interests, and enlarge the market for the productions, of Free Labor.

It is thought by many, that the Liberty Party ought to take ground on at least some of the questions which now agitate the political world. There is reason in this. While the objects just named should engross the chief attention of such a party, due respect should be had to other matters. On some points there can be no difficulty. For example, all will agree that the standard of education should be elevated, and its benefit diffused through the entire mass of the community; that a rigid economy should be observed in public expenditures; and few will object to the expediency of so amending the constitution, as to make the President eligible but for one term.

On the two great questions, the Tariff, and the Currency, it may be more difficult to act wisely and harmoniously. For one, I think a high protective tariff opposed to right principles, and of course, sound policy. In the present condition of things, however, the Government must be supported by a system of imposts. Direct taxation is out of the question. The genius of the American people is repugnant to it, and the existence of southern slavery would render it impracticable. All then will concur in the propriety of a tariff, to defray the economical expenditures of the Government. With this as a standard, we see no reason why discriminative duties may not be laid, so as without injuring the interests of any particular class, to encourage home-industry. Such ground, we think, might be wisely and safely taken by the Liberty Party; but only for a time. *Free trade* is most assuredly the true policy of all nations. But, we cannot acknowledge the sound policy of retaliatory duties. The history of our Government, we think, would show, that negotiation with a view of obtaining reciprocity in trade, has done more to enlarge the market for this country's productions, than any scheme of retaliatory duties. Negotiation, we know, has done a great deal for slaveholding products—cotton, rice, tobacco. Let us have an administration which will as steadily negotiate for the interests of free labor, with a view to open markets for grain, pork, &c. If this policy should fail, it will then be time enough to think of punishing ourselves, for the sake of bringing other people to their senses.

But, for a tariff, graduated strictly according to the wants of the Government, and within this limit, discriminative to such an extent, as not to oppress greater interest, for the sake of exalting lesser, and not permanently tax the consumer, for the benefit of the manufacturer, we think the Liberty Party should go. In truth, the true principle of this party is, equal and exact justice to all men—a regard for the equal rights of all—and in the light of this principle it must decide on modes of policy, else it is false to its professions.

As to the currency question, there is more difficulty, but happily we are not bound to commit ourselves to any particular mode of settling it. Long before we can acquire sufficient power to feel any responsibility as an organization for the settlement of this question, the whole matter will have been arranged, and new questions may be started for consideration. Should we do any thing more now, than state some general principles, in which all anti-slavery men ought to be agreed? For example, could we unite upon such a resolution as the following?

The Vicksburgh Daily Whig fumes at this account.

"We much mistake the spirit of the times if those who like aggressions will be longer tolerated by the American people, and we hope to see our Government take prompt and effectual steps for a speedy and efficient retribution. The people demand it, and if our rulers fail to uphold the honor of the country by repelling all aggressions and punishing all marauders, they will incur the lasting contempt and execration of our whole people. In a manner of this kind our people know no parties—they stand up in defense of rights for which we have twice waged a bloody war with the ocean Queen, and that they are ready now as in times past to enter into a war which shall be eternal sooner than bow in submission to the arrogant and unjust exactions of the Buccaneers of England. The unwarrantable aggressions of England must be met at once, and the sooner the better. Their last outrage is but one more added to the long catalogue of wrongs and injuries for which she must atone, and it must be stoned for, though the stone must be in blood. Better, far better, would it be to see all our cities ashes, our fields made desolate, our rivers converted into streams of blood, and the bones of our countrymen bleaching upon our hills, than to see a mighty nation of freemen who fold their arms in quiet, and tamely yield to a nation whose pirate arms are already extending to every quarter of the habitable globe; and whose every step is marked with crime, rapine and murder."

It is announced in the papers, that Great Britain has given up, by official declaration, the right of searching vessels under our flag. When shall we go to war? To support a gang of harpies, who are damning this nation to infamy, by trafficking in human flesh? Go to war in defense of the infernal coast-wise slave-traffic? Richly should we deserve to be blasted by the lightnings of Heaven, could we be so reckless of all principle and all shame. No—No—if we must have war, let us have it where the end at least can be spoken of without a blush—where Great Britain is clearly in the wrong. Great consternation was apparent at once among the slave party, who immediately moved a call of the House to bring in their stragglers before the main vote should be taken. An hour or more was consumed in this way, and finally a way was found of staving off the question for one day, under the rule that a petition which gives rise to debate must lie over, and Mr. Meriwether, and some others declared they wanted to debate the subject. Mr. Adams said it was all the same to him, but he thought the House would find that it would take up much less time if they would consent to receive our petitions and refer them, the same as others.

Mr. Adams then presented a large number of petitions, of different forms. Those that prayed for the repeal or amendment of any law, or for any alteration of the constitution, were generally referred to the committee on the judiciary; those which prayed for the abolition of slavery and slave trade in this District or a removal of the seat of Government, were rejected as to the first part, and the latter referred to the same committee; those which related to the gag were referred to the proposed select committee when it is appointed; those relating to the recognition of Haiti, and the exclusion of Texas, to the committee on foreign relations; those remonstrating against the admission of Florida into the Union as a slave State, to the judiciary committee; those praying such alteration in the laws as will relieve the people of the free States who have conscientious scruples against supporting slavery from all

into considerable excitement, yesterday, by the arrival of the brig Creole, with the intelligence that 135 slaves on board had risen, in the vicinity of the island of Abaco, murdered a passenger, severely wounded the captain, and forced the vessel into Nassau, New Providence, where most of the slaves were set at liberty by the British authorities. We have the particulars of this outrage from Mr. Goddard, the former mate, and now the master of the Creole, and give them as briefly as possible.

The Creole, Captain Enson, of Richmond, sailed from that port, for New Orleans, on the 27th of October, with a cargo of tobacco, four passengers, and one hundred and fifty-five slaves; At 8 o'clock on the evening of Sunday, the 8th ultimo, the captain supposed himself to be in the vicinity of Abaco, and hoisted the brig to. At nine o'clock the slaves commenced the attack, shooting Mr. Goddard the mate, in charge of the deck, with a pistol.

The ball slightly wounded him in the back of the head. He made for the cabin, and gave the alarm to the captain and passengers, who had "turned in." The negroes followed, obstructed the passage from the cabin, exclaiming, "we've got 'em, kill 'em as they come out!" Mr. Goddard fired round out, and, although bruised with clubs and stabbed in one or two places, reached the main deck, and took refuge in the maintop. Captain Enson followed, and said he was badly stabbed and thought he was dying. Soon after he fainted, and the mate made him fast to the rigging. A desperate affray took place on the deck. Mr. Goddard, a passenger, killed one negro with a musket, and afterwards fought like a tiger until he was killed. Several of the sailors fought bravely until they were completely overpowered. The captain and mate remained in the maintop until about five o'clock in the morning, when they were discovered. The ringleaders then ordered them to come down, or they would shoot them. Mr. Goddard descended and told them he was at their disposal. One of them presented a musket to his breast, and he informed he must take them to an English island, or the slaves would shoot him. He finally escaped, and shaped the course of the vessel towards New Providence. Two of the sailors were able to assist him; the others had all been badly wounded in the conflict. In the morning the captain was taken down, and, with the second mate, (Mr. Stevens,) the captain's wife, his daughter, (four years old,) niece, (fifteen years old,) and one of the passengers, confined in the fore hold. In the course of the night, the slaves had rifled the vessel, broken open the trunks, and decked themselves out in such clothing as they could find.

On Tuesday morning, at 8 o'clock, the brig arrived at Nassau. We make the following extract from the letter of Mr. J. T. Bacon, American Consul at Nassau:—"The American consul, immediately after the arrival of the Creole, had the captain and crew of the men taken on shore, and their hands dressed, and also those of the slaves, to prevent the slaves from going on shore; he well knewing if this was not done, it would be impossible to secure those guilty of the murder. This was compiled with, and an investigation ordered to be taken by two magistrates. The consul also has taken testimony of the passengers and crew. Nineteen slaves were identified as having taken an active part in the mutiny and massacre, and confined until further orders, the Governor refusing to send them to America for the present; and the remainder of the slaves, with the exception of five, were liberated."

"By the interference of her Majesty's subjects and the authorities of the colony, they were considered and treated as passengers, with the right to go on shore in boats whenever they pleased; while the consul contended that they were, under the circumstances of the case, as much the slaves of the master as the crew. The British Government had not the right to interfere in any manner that would procure their liberation.

"The captain is convalescing, and will probably recover, though it will be very slowly. On their liberation, the other wounded are doing well. On their return to America, advertising for emigrants, passage paid, and a number of them have entered their names to go."

Beyond this there is but little to state. After the arrival of the Creole at Nassau, the slaves acknowledged that a Baptist minister, at Norfolk, named Bourne, had advised them with regard to their course, and given them directions how to proceed. Mr. Goddard learned at Nassau that Bourne had formerly resided there, and had absconded, leaving his family. He is an Englishman, and about forty years of age.

Forty of the slaves on the Creole were owned by Thomas McCargo, of Richmond; the balance belonged to Johnson & Eperson. Mr. Howell was the agent of McCargo, and was well known in this city. Three of the slaves were killed in the affray, and one died of his wounds after his arrival at Nassau. Five more (four females and a boy) refused to accept their freedom, and came to this port in the Creole. It is worthy of remark that a dog, belonging to the Captain, fought courageously against the negroes, and bit several of them seriously.

He was finally killed.

We have some interesting particulars in relation to the conduct of the British authorities at Nassau. That the entire scheme was resolved upon before the brig left Richmond, is evident from the fact, that the negroes boasted at Nassau that they expected to encounter the brigs Long Island and Orleans, which sailed from Richmond in company with the Creole, with cargoes of slaves. Both of these vessels however, are safe in port. A full investigation of this case, we doubt not, will present some very strange developments.

The Vicksburgh Daily Whig fumes at this account.

"We much mistake the spirit of the times if those who like aggressions will be longer tolerated by the American people, and we hope to see our Government take prompt and effectual steps for a speedy and efficient retribution. The people demand it, and if our rulers fail to uphold the honor of the country by repelling all aggressions and punishing all marauders, they will incur the lasting contempt and execration of our whole people.

In a manner of this kind our people know no parties—they stand up in defense of rights for which we have twice waged a bloody war with the ocean Queen, and that they are ready now as in times past to enter into a war which shall be eternal sooner than bow in submission to the arrogant and unjust exactions of the Buccaneers of England. The unwarrantable aggressions of England must be met at once, and the sooner the better. Their last outrage is but one more added to the long catalogue of wrongs and injuries for which she must atone, and it must be stoned for, though the stone must be in blood. Better, far better, would it be to see all our cities ashes, our fields made desolate, our rivers converted into streams of blood, and the bones of our countrymen bleaching upon our hills, than to see a mighty nation of freemen who fold their arms in quiet, and tamely yield to a nation whose pirate arms are already extending to every quarter of the habitable globe; and whose every step is marked with crime, rapine and murder."

It is announced in the papers, that Great Britain has given up, by official declaration, the right of searching vessels under our flag. When shall we go to war? To support a gang of harpies, who are damning this nation to infamy, by trafficking in human flesh? Go to war in defense of the infernal coast-wise slave-traffic? Richly should we deserve to be blasted by the lightnings of Heaven, could we be so reckless of all principle and all shame. No—No—if we must have war, let us have it where the end at least can be spoken of without a blush—where Great Britain is clearly in the wrong. Great consternation was apparent at once among the slave party, who immediately moved a call of the House to bring in their stragglers before the main vote should be taken. An hour or more was consumed in this way, and finally a way was found of staving off the question for one day, under the rule that a petition which gives rise to debate must lie over, and Mr. Meriwether, and some others declared they wanted to debate the subject. Mr. Adams said it was all the same to him, but he thought the House would find that it would take up much less time if they would consent to receive our petitions and refer them, the same as others.

Mr. Adams then presented a large number of petitions, of different forms. Those that prayed for the repeal or amendment of any law, or for any alteration of the constitution, were generally referred to the committee on the judiciary; those which prayed for the abolition of slavery and slave trade in this District or a removal of the seat of Government, were rejected as to the first part, and the latter referred to the same committee; those which related to the gag were referred to the proposed select committee when it is appointed; those relating to the recognition of Haiti, and the exclusion of Texas, to the committee on foreign relations; those remonstrating against the admission of Florida into the Union as a slave State, to the judiciary committee; those praying such alteration in the laws as will relieve the people of the free States who have conscientious scruples against supporting slavery from all

LIBERTY VOTE.

The following may be relied on as a correct report on the whole, of the Liberty vote in 42 counties of this State. There can now be no doubt that the entire vote must have been somewhat over 3000. Last year it was 902.—Next year it will be 15,000.

Counties. No. of votes. Counties. No. of votes.
Adams, 42 Green, 164
Ashabula, 7 Hamilton, 36
Athens & Meigs, 89 Harrison, 64
Belmont, 97 Highland, 72
Brown, 51 Holmes, 3
Carroll, 30 Jefferson, 32
Champaign, 8 Knox, 112
Clermont, 21 Lake, 5
Clinton, 48 Licking, 52
Columbian, 100 Logan, 60

Crawford Dela- 141 Lorain, 233
ware & Marion, 155 Portage, 45
Cuyahoga, 1 Stark, 34
Dark, Mercer, 119 Summit, 182
Miami & Shelby, 57 Trumbull, 370
Fayette, 34 Union, 20
Franklin, 141 Ross, 56
Geauga, 12

2,746

If any of our friends detect errors in the list, we hope they will correct them. Will they see to it that we are furnished with returns from the rest of the counties.

[FROM OUR WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT.]

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17, 1841.

DR. BAILEY:

I understand you have from another able hand a description of the cowardly and dishonorable retreat effected by the slaveholders last week from the field of discussion respecting the rules and orders—led, too, by the very man who had, the day before, ostentatiously declared his readiness to give the subject a full consideration. The Speaker conducted himself with great dignity, and I believe intended to be quite impartial and independent. On one petition to wit: for a repeal of the laws regulating or sanctioning the transportation of slaves coastwise from one state to another, he was understood to decide that this petition came within the rule, because it was a base violation of an honorable understanding authorized by his own words, but was not only a base violation of the laws of Congress, but was framed with the express design of conforming to the decision in the Mississippi case, and bringing the action of the Federal Government within its proper limits, and leaving the several states to take care of the slaves within their respective borders as well as they can, provided they do not attempt to practice their infamous system within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government, on the high seas. The subject will be brought up again to-morrow, and I think a very interesting question will grow out of it. However, we are very well satisfied with this day's work. Now, my advice is, that petitions be multiplied on the points that are admitted, and that are referred to Committees; and that all discussion be had of those points in the papers, so as to impress the respective Committees with a sense of their responsibility to make such reports as will meet the question and establish the law on the basis of justice and truth.

JASHER.

obligation to aid in maintaining or upholding it, to the same committee. In presenting the petition in favor of the recognition of Haiti, Mr. Adams said, pleasantly, that had nothing to do with slavery, there was no slavery in Haiti. A memorial reciting the strong resolutions of the Massachusetts legislature in 1840, and closing with a prayer that these resolutions may be complied with, was decided by the speaker to be within the rule. So, says Mr. Adams, the Legislature of the Commonwealth can't be heard here.

Anti-slavery petitions of different forms were

presented by several other members, but before

the call of states had proceeded through the

New York delegation, the House adjourned.—

So, we shall have more of it to-morrow, going

through the presentation of petitions, and then

it will come up in another form on Mr. Adam's motion for a select committee to repeat the gag.

The Speaker conducted himself with great

dignity, and I believe intended to be quite im-

partial and independent.

On one petition to wit:

for a repeal of the laws regulating or sanc-

tioning the transportation of slaves coastwise

from one state to another,

he was understood to decide that this peti-

tion came within the rule, because it was a base

violation of an honorable under-

sstanding authorized by his own words,

but was not only a base violation of the laws of

Congress, but was framed with the express de-

sign of conforming to the decision in the Mis-

sissippi case, and bringing the action of the Fed-

eral Government within its proper limits,

and leaving the several

states to take care of the slaves within their

respective borders as well as they can,

provided they do not attempt to practice their

infamous system within the exclusive jurisdic-

tion of the Federal Government, on the high seas.

The subject will be brought up again to-mor-

row, and I think a very interesting question will grow out of it. However, we are very well satisfied with this day's work. Now, my advice is, that petitions be multiplied on the points that are admitted, and that are referred to Committees; and that all discussion be had of those points in the papers, so as to impress the respective Committees with a sense of their responsibility to make such reports as will meet the question and establish the law on the basis of justice and truth.

The message, on the whole, is not well received. It is too democratic for the strong whigs, and not enough so for the Bentonian democrats. Benton assails the banking project of Mr. Tyler, as unconstitutional, in the very particulars in which it coincides most nearly with Gen. Jackson's views, in his message of 1830.

But I forbear further comment on it, and wish to refer briefly to other matters. In the New England States, the asperities once existing among the divided friends of the slave, have nearly disappeared. The union in favor of the Liberty party between the voting friends of both organizations is so nearly perfect that the dissenters gave only 40 scattering votes, at the late election in Massachusetts, where their members are greatest; and the union is cordial as well as outward and visible.

Passing through Maryland, a few days since, I learned that the contemplated State "Slaveholder's Convention" in January, is the work of the Maryland Colonization Society, which failing in its efforts induce the voluntary emigration of the people of color, is endeavoring to arouse the people to the employment of violent measures for that end. The frequency and ease with which their slaves escape, has greatly troubled the benevolent patriarchs, who would fain devise some means to "get rid of the free niggers," and at the same time, make the bond of the slaveholder to be broken. The slaveholders of Maryland and Virginia are truly in a bad predicament. Since the decline in the price of cotton, their profits from the sale of slaves have very much diminished. The Texan branch of the slave-trade, is perhaps the only one, now very profitable, and that is quite limited.

Tobacco is ruinously depreciated, for want of a larger foreign market. Hence their system is very profitless. What will the patriarchs do? I hear that the old abolition feeling in Western Virginia is rising again and demanding an extension of suffrage to the poor whites, as a means of something exterior.

Yours for Liberty,

WASHINGTON.

HON. JEREMIAH MORROW.

On our first page, is an able letter to the Hon. Jeremiah Morrow. It is to be regretted that he did not see fit to reply. Views are presented in it, that might well deserve the consideration of every statesman.

STATE CONVENTION.

The friends of Liberty are requested to meet this evening, at 7 o'clock, at the office on Main st., to appoint delegates to the State Convention.

COLUMBUS

